PATENTS Application Serial No. 09/697,233 Confirmation No. 3470 Attorney Docket No. NMC-003.01

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Pych, Joseph)	
	r yen, soseph) Art Unit: 3639	
Applica	tion No: 09/697,233)	
) Confirmation No.: 3470	
Filed:	October 26, 2000)	
) Examiner: Robinson Bo	oyce,
For:	SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR) Akiba K	,
	GENERATING HIGHLY)	
	RESPONSIVE PROSPECT LISTS	Ó	

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Applicant hereby traverses the Office Action mailed on May 5, 2006. The Examiner bases her restriction of Applicant's application on 35 U.S.C § 121, which permits restriction in an application that claims two or more "independent and distinct" inventions, i.e., inventions that are "unconnected in design, operation and effect." *See* MPEP §802.01. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of that requirement, because a close inspection of the two inventions reveals that their effect and operation is essentially the same.

The Examiner states on page 3 of the Office Action that:

the combination of [Group II] deals with the identification of second list purchasers through identification of lists that were successfully used by a first list purchaser. The subcombination [Group I] has separate utility such as identifying successful lists of prospective customers for a list purchaser.

PATENTS Application Serial No. 09/697,233

Confirmation No. 3470

Attorney Docket No. NMC-003.01

But the inventions of both Groups I and II have the same effect: they both provide a

first list purchaser with a targeted list of prospective customers. Moreover, the operation by

which they obtain that effect is also the same: choosing prospective customers from a group

of selected lists. The only difference is the criterion used for selecting the group of selected

lists. In Group I, the criterion for list selection is that the targeted list and a list identified as

successful by the first list purchaser share similar content, whereas in Group II, it is that they

share similar users. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider

the restriction requirement.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.143, though, Applicant provisionally elects claims

2 to 8, 10 to 13, 17 to 18, 56, 57 and 59 to 62 of Group II.

Any questions raised by this submission may be directed to the undersigned at

(617) 832-1257. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayments, or

credit any overpayments, to our Deposit Account No. 06-1448, Reference NMC-003.01.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 1, 2006

Customer No: 25181

Patent Group Foley Hoag, LLP

155 Seaport Blvd.

Boston, MA 02210-2600

/Ruth J. Ma/

Ruth J. Ma, Reg. No. 55,414

Attorney for Applicant

Tel. No. (617) 832-1183

Fax. No. (617) 832-7000

B3248251.2

2